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Reviewer's report:

The present narrative review investigates the potential effect and safety of medicinal cannabis in psychiatric disorders. The manuscript is well written, and appears balanced in its discussion. However, there are some potential problems that need to be addressed before it is possible to judge the validity of the review's findings.

In what must be the Methods section, we are told that the authors searched databases INCLUDING so and so. This is inadequate. We need to know exactly which databases were searched.

We also need to know the search strings that were used to identify studies.

We need to know how the search was performed and studies screened. Who among the authors did what, and did two authors do certain tasks in parallel, as would usually be recommended.

Either for each of the psychiatric disorders, or at least overall, we need a PRISMA flow diagram of study selection. How many studies were screened, how many were excluded without or with stated reasons, and so on.

The authors do not appear to have conducted bias assessments of the included studies. While I can see how this may be overkill given the small number of included studies, it would still be helpful to be given an idea of bias in the included studies so that we know the quality of the nascent level of evidence.
Some of the authors appear to have certain conflicts of interest. I am unable to judge how the stated disclosures may affect impartiality. I would like the authors to elaborate on this.

Minor comments:

Please refrain from using the MC acronym in abstract and text. It is confusing.

It is unclear where the introduction ends. I would suggest headings and / or subheadings indicating the start of Aims, Methods, Results and Discussion.

A lot of what reads like the introduction has a feeling of being a historical textbook of cannabis use. This is largely irrelevant for the present review.

Regarding schizophrenia, the authors state the cross-sectional relationship between cannabis and schizophrenia. They may want to also highlight the longitudinal associations.

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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